REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated September 26, 2006 are respectfully requested. Claims 16-20 are submitted herewith. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. 101 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 36, 37, 39, 40, and 41 of prior U. S. application no. 10/343,419.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaeck et al. [US Pub. No. 2003/0163513 A1].

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. [US Pub. No. 2003/0163513 A1] in view of Delany et al. [US Pub. No. 20020138763].

35 U.S.C. 101 Rejections

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 11, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. The Examiner claims that the invention provides no physical transformation and no tangible result. The Applicant submits that the amendments this lack of utility rejection.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to read "A method <u>for providing a system</u> <u>administrator with a view of a totality of applications accessible by a user,</u> comprising: identifying <s>a plurality</s> <u>the totality</u> of applications accessible by <s>a</s> the user by examining authentication credential container of the user; <s>and</s> generating a view of the <s>plurality</s> <u>totality</u> of applications accessible by the user<u>; and displaying the view to the</u> <u>administrator.</u>" The display mentioned in claim 1, as amended, provides a physical transformation (of the display medium) and a tangible result (the display itself). The applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, and also claim 2, which depends from claim 1, have patentable utility.

Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended to read "An apparatus <u>for providing a system</u> <u>administrator with a view of a totality of applications accessible by a user</u>, comprising: an identifier module to identify <s>a plurality</s> <u>the totality</u> of applications accessible by <s>a</s> <u>the</u> user by examining authentication credential container of the user; <s>and</s> a view generator to generate a view of the <s>plurality</s> <u>totality</u> of applications accessible by the user<u>; and a view</u> <u>displayer to display the view of the totality of applications accessible by the user to the</u> <u>administrator.</u>" The view displayer mentioned in claim 11, as amended, provides a physical transformation (of the displayed view) and a tangible result (the displayed view itself). The applicant respectfully submits that claim 11, as amended, and also claim 12, which depends from claim 11, have patentable utility.

Claim 15

Claim 15 has been amended to read "An apparatus <u>for providing a system</u> <u>administrator with a view of a totality of applications accessible by a user,</u> comprising: means for identifying <s>a plurality</s> <u>the totality</u> of applications accessible by <s>a</s> <u>the</u> user by examining authentication credential container of the user; <s>and</s> means for generating a view of the <s>plurality</s> <u>totality</u> of applications accessible by the user<u>; and means for</u> <u>displaying the view of the totality of applications accessible by the user to the</u>

administrator." The means for displaying the view of the totality of applications mentioned in claim 15, as amended, provide a physical transformation (of the displayed view) and a tangible result (the displayed view itself). The applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, as amended, has patentable utility.

The Examiner also rejects claims 1, 5, 8, 11, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 36, 37, 39, 40, and 41 of prior U.S. application no. 10/343,419. The applicant suggests that the Examiner intended to reference prior U.S. application no. 10/383,419, by the same inventor, of which the current application is a Continuation-in-part. The application mentioned by the Examiner is by a different inventor and is on a different subject.

The Applicant submits that the claims as amended overcome any double patenting rejection, whether type statutory or obviousness.

The Cited Prior Art

Schaeck et al.

Schaeck et al. disclose methods, systems, and computer programs for providing role-specific views into aggregated services in a computing network, where an aggregated service is a collection of applications and services and a role-specific view is a view tailored to a particular user role, such as customer, system administrator, or business manager. Users having different roles are presented with different views into the same aggregated service and have to different user rights. An example of an aggregated service is an online shopping service, comprising a number of sub-services such as accessing an electronic catalog, processing end-user orders, checking the credit status of a customer, managing delivery of orders to customers, etc. Users having the role of customer might be permitted to view a catalog and order goods; users having the role of system administrator might be permitted to create a composite shopping services and to add or delete services from the composite service; and users having the role of business manager might be permitted to make various changes to a composite shopping service such as selecting the providers of the sub-services of which the composite service is composed.

The various user roles associated with a user are stored in a user profile associated with the user. Schaeck et al. state that user roles are determined using the user's identification and credentials (paragraph 22), and state that user profiles may include user access rights information (paragraph 66), but do not state that user profiles are credential containers or directories of user names, passwords, or other authentication information. Schaeck et al. state that user profiles may optionally be queried, changed, or deleted (paragraph 66), but do not disclose a view of user profiles. Schaeck et al. state that user log-on information (including user names, passwords, and user roles) is preferably contained in a directory in which that information can be looked up. Such a directory would correspond to the credential container of the present application. However, Schaeck et al. do not disclose a view of such a directory such as a displayed list of user names and passwords. Schaeck et al. mention presenting a user with a list of available applications (paragraph 80), but do not state the extent of the list or say how the list is obtained. In general, Schaeck et al. do not disclose a view of the totality of the applications accessible by the user, or a display of such a view. It follows that Schaeck et al. do not disclose providing a system administrator with a view of the totality of the applications accessible by a user or displaying such a view to such an administrator, as in the system of the applicant.

Delany et al.

Delany et al. disclose technology for modifying groups or other types of entries after the entries have been created. One embodiment includes creating an entry for an Identity System, where the entry includes a set of attributes based on a set of classes. A subset of the attributes are added to or removed from the entry after creation of the entry. For example, a group can be modified by adding or deleting members.

Delany et al. teach an access management system that provides identity management services and/or access management services for a network. The access management system provides for identity profiles to be used across multiple domains. An identity profile is a set of information associated with an entity such as a user, group, or organization. The data elements of the identity profile are termed "attributes". Attributes may include such things as user names and passwords. The system of

Delany et al. includes a user manager that creates and deletes user identity profiles, modifies user identity profile data, determines user access privileges, and manages user credentials. The system also includes a group manager that permits the creation, deletion, and management of groups of users with identical access privileges to one or more resources. The group manager can add and delete users from a group.

Delany et al. disclose a directory server that stores the authentication criteria of the resources to which users may have or lack access. But Delany et al. do not disclose or suggest a directory or list of the totality of applications to which a particular user has access, a view of such a directory or list, or a display of such a directory or list to an administrator.

The Prior Art Distinguished

Claim 1

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaeck et al. The Examiner identifies the services mentioned by Schaeck et al. with the applications mentioned by the applicant, and identifies the user profiles mentioned by Schaeck et al. with the credential containers mentioned by the applicant. The Examiner further states that Schaeck et al. disclose a method of examining the authentication credential container of the user, and cites Schaeck et al., paragraph 81, lines 1-11 in support of this claim. Paragraph 81 mentions retrieving a user's role information from a directory that includes user roles and user log-in information (such as user names and passwords).

The applicant does not at this time dispute the Examiner's identification of the services mentioned by Schaeck et al. with the applications mentioned by the applicant or the Examiner's identification of the directories mentioned by Schaeck et al. with the credential containers mentioned by the applicant. But the applicant questions the Examiner's identification of the user profiles mentioned by Schaeck et al. with the credential containers mentioned by the applicant. Schaeck et al. state that user roles are determined using the user's identification and credentials (paragraph 22), state that user roles are contained in user profiles (paragraph 22), and state that user profiles may

include user access rights information (paragraph 66), but do not state that user profiles are credential containers or directories of user names, passwords, or other authentication information.

The Examiner states that Schaeck et al. disclose generating a view of the plurality of applications accessible by the user, and cites Schaeck et al., paragraph 43, lines 5-7 and paragraph 68, lines 4-8, in support of this claim. Paragraph 43, lines 5-7 read "...to a particular role. The present invention is directed toward providing these role-specific views for aggregated services. It will be appreciated by those familiar with the art that ..." Paragraph 68, lines 4-8 read "... role-specific views of that service. The services may then be aggregated as described in the related inventions, and the techniques of the present invention may be used for selectively invoking the role-specific views, based on the programmatically-determined role of a particular user. For ..." These passages mention role-specific views for aggregated services (applications), but do not disclose or suggest views of a plurality or totality of the services (applications) accessible by a user as disclosed by the applicant. Schaeck et al. give as an example of role-specific views a view of a retail shopping service for a user in the role of consumer that shows graphic images of featured sale items (paragraph 68). Such views are very different from the views disclosed by the applicant.

The views of the system of the applicant differ from the views of Schaeck et al. in at least three important respects. First, the views of the applicant are designed to provide a system administrator with an overview of the applications accessible by a user to facilitate account management. The views of Schaeck et al. do not serve this purpose. Second, claim 1 has been amended to read, in part "generating a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user ..." Schaeck et al. do not disclose or suggest a view in any role of the totality of applications accessible by a user; Schaeck et al. disclose at most a view of an aggregated service; that is, a limited collection of applications. Third, the views of Schaeck et al. are provided through portals, which Schaeck et al. acknowledge to be typically Web pages known as portal pages (paragraph 6). Portals typically are available only over the Internet. The views of the applicant are not limited to Internet-based resources in this way.

Claim 1 has also been amended to read, in part, " ... and displaying the view to the administrator." The view that is displayed to an administrator is a view of the totality

of applications accessible by a user. Schaeck et al. do not disclose or suggest displaying to an administrator a view of the totality of applications accessible by a user.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, and also claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1, are not anticipated by Schaeck et al. and are therefore acceptable over Schaeck et al.

Claim 11

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaeck et al. Claim 11 has been amended to read, in part, "... a view generator to generate a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user, and a view displayer to display the view of the totality of applications accessible by the user to the administrator." Schaeck et al. mention a directory of a user's roles and log-in information, but do not disclose or suggest a view generator that generates a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user or a view displayer that displays a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user to an administrator. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 11, as amended, and also claims 12-14, which depend from claim 11, are not anticipated by Schaeck et al., and are therefore acceptable over Schaeck et al.

Claim 15

The Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaeck et al. Claim 15 has been amended to read, in part, "...means for generating a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user, and means for displaying the view of the totality of applications accessible by the user to the administrator." Schaeck et al. mention a directory of user roles and log-in information, but do not disclose or suggest means for generating a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user or means for displaying a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user to an administrator. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, as amended, is not anticipated by Schaeck et al., and is therefore allowable over Schaeck et al.

Claim 3

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaeck et al. Claim 15 has been amended to read, in part, "... removing access to an application from the totality of the applications by utilizing the view of the totality of the applications accessible by the user." The applicant has argued above, in connection with claims 1, 11, and 15, that Schaeck et al. do not disclose or suggest a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user.

The Examiner claims that Schaeck et al. disclose a method for deleting or removing access to a service or application, and cites Schaeck et al., paragraph 43, lines 9-15, in support of this claim. Paragraph 43 mentions that a user in the role of administrator might be allowed to delete services (applications) from a composite service. But deleting applications from a composite service does not necessarily remove a user's access to those applications; such deletion only affects the ability of a user to access the applications through the composite service. The user's password for the applications may still be valid, and the user may still be able to log into the applications. Schaeck et al. do not disclose removing a user's ability to log into an application as in the system of the applicant. The Examiner's claim is therefore without support.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 3, as amended, is not anticipated by Schaeck et al. and is therefore allowable over Schaeck et al.

Claim 13

The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaeck et al. Claim 13 has been amended to read, in part, "...an interface to assist in removing access to an application from the totality of the applications by utilizing the view of the totality of the applications accessible by the user." The applicant has argued above, in connection with claims 1, 3, 11, and 15, that Schaeck et al. do not disclose or suggest a view of the totality of applications accessible by the user. The applicant has also argued above, in connection with claim 3, that Schaeck et al. do not disclose removing access to an application, but only disclose deleting an application from a composite service. It follows that Schaeck et al. do not disclose an interface to assist in

removing access to an application. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 13, as amended, is not anticipated by Schaeck et al. and is therefore allowable over Schaeck et al.

Claim 6

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaeck et al. The Examiner claims that Schaeck et al. disclose automatically deleting or removing access to a service or application. The applicant has argued above, in connection with claims 3 and 13, that Schaeck et al. do not disclose removing access to an application, but only disclose deleting an application from a composite service. It follows that Schaeck et al. do not disclose automatically removing access to an application. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is not anticipated by Schaeck et al., and is therefore allowable over Schaeck et al.

Claims 2 and 12

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al. The Examiner states that Delany et al. disclose a consolidated directory of the plurality of the applications (accessible by a user), and cites Delany et al., paragraph 113, lines 13-18, and paragraph 129, lines 16-20, in support of this claim. Paragraph 113, lines 13-18, mentions adding and removing users from groups of users but does not mention a directory of applications (plurality or totality) accessible by a user. Paragraph 129, lines 16-20, mentions data stores that are LDAP directory servers with LDAP directories, but does not state that the directories are directories of the (plurality or totality of the) applications accessible by a user. Thus, the Examiner's claim is without support. Since Schaeck et al. do not disclose or suggest a consolidated directory of the totality of the applications accessible by a user, it follows that neither Schaeck et al. nor Delany et al. disclose or suggest a consolidated directory of the totality of the applications accessible by a user. Further, neither Schaeck et al. or Delany et al. disclose or suggest displaying such a view (directory) of the totality of the applications accessible by a user to an administrator. The applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 12, as amended, are

not obvious in light of Schaeck et al. and Delany et al. and are therefore patentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al.

Claims 4 and 14

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al. The Examiner claims that Delany et al. disclose creating a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user, and cites Delany et al., paragraph 108, lines 1-8, and paragraph 109, lines 12-16, in support of this claim. Paragraph 108 mentions creation of user identity profiles, but does not mention or suggest creation of a user account for a new application. Paragraph 109 mentions creation of users in a user directory, but does not mention or suggest creation of a user account for a new application. The Examiner's claim is therefore without support. The Examiner also claims that Delany et al. disclose (injecting) authentication information of the user account into the authentication credential container of the user, and cites Delany et al., paragraph 108, lines 1-8, and paragraph 109, lines 12-16, in support of this claim. The applicant has argued that Delany et al. do not disclose or suggest creation of a user account in the cited passages; it follows that Delany et al. do not disclose or suggest injecting authentication information of such a user account in the cited passages. Paragraph 108 mentions creation of user identity profiles, modification of user identity profile data, and credentials management, but does not directly disclose injecting authentication information of a user account into an identity profile or authentication credential container. The Examiner's claim is therefore without support. Thus, neither Schaeck et al. nor Delany et al. disclose or suggest creating a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user or injecting authentication information of the user account into the authentication credential container of the user. The applicant respectfully submits that claims 4 and 14 are not obvious in light of Schaeck et al. and Delany et al., and are therefore patentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al.

Claim 5

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al. The Examiner states that Schaeck et al. disclose an authentication credential container and a server. Schaeck et al., paragraph 81, lines 1-11, disclose a directory that contains authentication credentials. Schaeck et al. elsewhere disclose a server. But Schaeck et al. do not disclose storing a directory of the totality of applications accessible by a user on a server. The Examiner states that Delany et al. disclose wherein the authentication credential container is stored at a server, and cites Delany et al., paragraph 128, lines 1-3, and paragraph 129, lines 1-4, in support of this claim. The cited passages mention a directory server that would involve a directory stored on a server, but do not state that the directory stored on the server is a consolidated directory of the totality of the applications accessible by a user. The Examiner's claim is therefore without support. Thus, neither Schaeck et al. nor Delany et al. disclose or suggest storing a consolidated directory of the totality of the applications accessible by a user on a server. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is not obvious in light of Schaeck et al. and Delany et al., and is therefore patentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al.

Claims 7 and 8

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al. The Examiner claims that Delany et al. disclose the creation of a user account, and cites Delany et al., paragraph 108, lines 1-8, and paragraph 109, lines 12-16, in support of this claim. The applicant has argued above, in connection with claims 4 and 14, that Delany et al. do not disclose creation of a user account. It follows that Delany et al. do not disclose creation of a user account either automatically (claim 7) or manually by an administrator (claim 8). The applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 8 are not obvious in light of Schaeck et al. and Delany et al., and are therefore patentable over Schaeck et al. in light of Delany et al.

Claim 9

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al. The Examiner states that Schaeck et al. disclose wherein the authentication information is injected into a hardware device of the user, and cites Schaeck et al., paragraph 52, lines 11-15, in support of this claim. The cited passage reads, "The fine-grained services may include any form of programming logic, including script programs, Java classes, COM classes, EJBs ("Enterprise JavaBeans"), stored procedures, IMS or other database transactions, legacy applications, and so forth." Schaeck et al. also state in paragraph 52 that the fine-grained services may reside locally; that is, on the user's machine. Schaeck et al. mention script programs and stored procedures, but do not mention authentication information or storing authentication information on a hardware device of the user. The Examiner's claim is therefore without support. Delany et al. also do not mention storing authentication information on a hardware device of the user. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is not obvious in light of Schaeck et al. and Delany et al., and is therefore patentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al.

Claim 10

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al. The Examiner states that Schaeck et al. disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising user directories for each application of the plurality of the applications accessible by the user, and cites Schaeck et al., paragraph 43, lines 5-7, and paragraph 68, line 4-8, in support of this claim. Paragraph 43, lines 5-7, reads "... to a particular role. The present invention is directed toward providing these role-specific views for aggregated services. It will be appreciated by those familiar with the art that ...." Paragraph 68, lines 4-8, reads "... role-specific views of that service. The services may then be aggregated as described in the related inventions, and the techniques of the present invention may be used for selectively invoking the role-specific views, based on the programmatically-determined role of a particular user. For ...." The applicant has argued above, in connection with claims 1 and 2, that the role-specific views of Schaeck et al. do not correspond to directories of

the applications accessible by the user. The examples of role-specific views provided by Schaeck et al. are not views of directories or lists of applications accessible by a user but are such as graphic images of items for sale (paragraph 68). Neither Schaeck et al. nor Delany et al. disclose or suggest views of directories or lists of all of the applications accessible by a user. The applicant therefore submits that claim 10 is not obvious in light of Schaeck et al. and Delany et al., and is therefore patentable over Schaeck et al. in view of Delany et al.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and the preceding arguments, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all other rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance.

No further fees are believed due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any deficiency in fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Brian R. Coleman
Registration No. 39,145

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P. O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
(650) 838-4300